



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ter, Canon 46; Telesphorus, Canon 48; Anacletus, Canon 59; Lucius, Canon 60; Anastasius, Canon 61; Alexander de Consecr. Dist. ii., Canon 1; Clement, Canon 23—all forged; besides many more never made by the Popes whose names they bear. From whence our readers may have some notion how the ceremonies of the mass did multiply so fast, and how the mass came to be so different from the simplicity of the Supper of the Lord, as it was celebrated by the Lord himself, and by his apostles after Him.

But we might go on for ever at the forgeries in this Decretum of Gratian. We stop at one instance more—**HOLY WATER**; for which Gratian quotes that passage of the forged letter of Pope Alexander (which we gave in our last number), *and that alone* (de Consecr. Dist. iii., Canon 20).

All these things Gratian found as acknowledged laws of the Roman Church, in the year 1151; and therefore he put them into his book. All these things continued in his book as undoubted and unquestioned laws of the Roman Church for at least four hundred and thirty years, and, perhaps, a good deal longer.

And this brings us to a fact in the history of the Decretum of Gratian, which shows far more strongly than we yet have shown it, the vast influence and authority which this book had acquired in the Church; and how little notice any one had, during all those centuries, of doubting or questioning all the forgeries in it.

At the end of the Council of Trent, about the year 1563, Pope Pius IV. (the same who drew up the creed of the Roman Catholic Church), was authorized by the Council of Trent to revise the Roman Missal and Breviary. About the same time, he undertook to revise and correct the Decretum of Gratian. For this purpose, he selected a number of the most learned cardinals and doctors in the Roman Church, to whom he committed that task. His successor, Pius V., added others; so that seven cardinals and seventeen doctors were employed, of whom two afterwards became popes.

These twenty-four most learned men spent more than sixteen years of most diligent labour in correcting the Decretum of Gratian, which they finally accomplished in the year 1580, under the pontificate of Pope Gregory XIII. There cannot be stronger proof of the vast importance and authority attached to this book in the Church of Rome.

What did those learned men do with the forgeries?

It is true, they do correct a forgery now and then, but not the forged Decretals. For instance:—Dist. xix., Canon 9., has this heading—“Anastasius, being rejected by God, was struck by the Divine Will;” which heading the canon itself seems fully to support. Now, this Anastasius was a pope, and the correctors may well have wondered how Gratian came to put in such a story about a Pope. They did not know that the real story which Gratian, no doubt, meant to give, and probably did give, was just the contrary, that some enemy of Pope Anastasius was thus struck by God. Probably some transcriber afterwards made the blunder in making a new copy. But the correctors, knowing nothing of this, pronounced, without hesitation, in the note which they added, that this story was a forgery. This shows that they felt that it was a part of their duty to point out forgeries in the Decretum of Gratian.

Yet of the THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN canons taken from the forged Decretals of the first 400 years, and of all the other canons taken from other similar forgeries, they never pointed out one as being a forgery!

On the contrary, they everywhere seek to uphold the authority of the forged bundle of Isidore.

They state in the preface which they prefixed to the Decretum, that Igmarus, Archbishop of Rheims, affirms, that it really was the famous Isidore, Bishop of Seville, in Spain, who made this collection, which, if true, would be strongest proof that the forged Decretals were genuine; and they do not say that it is not true.

They appeal to the *testimony* of the writer of this forged collection, “as Isidore himself testifies.”

In many of their notes on forged canons, they speak of the forger as if he were a person of credit, and of the forgeries, as if they were genuine.” (11)

Having done all this to support the credit of the forgeries, and having never given the smallest hint that any doubt was, or could be thrown on all these forged canons, they say in their preface, respecting the diligence with which the work was done, that “after this scarcely any one can err *so as to follow uncertain things for certain*, or to hold suspected those which were certain, as if they were uncertain.” (12)

Had they no suspicion, when they wrote that passage, that Isidore’s Papal Decretals might be forged? Was it possible that during 16 years spent in examining these canons, and comparing them with the monstrous and absurd forgeries which Isidore had concocted (and it is evident that they *did* compare them *carefully*), that no suspicion should ever have arisen in their minds?

They were in constant communication with Antonius Augustinus, Archbishop of Tarragon in Spain, the most learned man of his day, and from him they received a great

part of their materials; and he certainly knew of grounds of suspicion, for he had observed that the Epistles of the early Popes did actually quote laws of the Roman emperors, which laws were not made for several hundred years after those popes lived! And he does not understand how this could be done!

But whether the correctors suspected the forgery or not, is of little consequence. If they did *not*, then we have proof how universally the forgeries were believed and accepted as the law of the Church: if they *did* suspect it, then we have proof that they did everything in their power to prevent others suspecting it; and that, notwithstanding their suspicions, they put forward the forged decrets in the Decretum, as things that no man, or no court of the Church of Rome, need hesitate to accept as genuine and true.

And the Decretum of Gratian, when thus corrected, was published by authority of a bull of Pope Gregory XIII., who had himself been one of the correctors before he was Pope.

That bull was dated, July 1, 1580, and in the beginning of it Pope Gregory gives, as the reason for correcting the Decretum, the duty of his office “to provide with all zeal and diligence for retaining all Christians in the true and Catholic faith, especially in these so grievous and calamitous times (the Reformation), and, therefore, that, in the first place, is to be attended to and provided for by us, that we may take away from all every occasion of wandering from it.” (13)

To accomplish this purpose he sends forth the Decretum of Gratian, with all its forgeries, sustained with fresh credit, and greater approbation; and to provide for the enduring continuance of those forgeries, he inserts this enactment into the bull, “that it shall not be lawful to any one to add anything to this work, or to change or to alter anything, or to ‘add any interpretation; but as it is now printed in this our city of Rome, let it always and for ever be preserved whole and unaltered.” (14) And this bull is always printed in the front of the Roman edition of the Decretum of Gratian.

But it was too late for Pope and Cardinals to make these forgeries perpetual. A mighty power had arisen, and was rolling onward, destined to sweep before it, in the next half century, the frauds and forgeries of seven hundred years. The reformers began, not long after, to question and convict the forgeries, and one by one all the most learned men of the Church of Rome were driven to admit the barefaced imposture which, so short a time before, they had sought to bolster up. In 50 years more the victory of truth over falsehood was complete; yet, even when the great battle was thus lost and won, the more zealous champions of the Roman Church, Turrianus the Jesuit, and Binius the Archbishop, made a last desperate effort to retrieve the day, and restore the reign of forgery in the Church. And Binius again ventured to defend the forged epistles of the Popes as being “consecrated by their own antiquity and the reverence of the whole world; filled with gravity, doctrine, and holiness; confirmed by the testimony and use of posterity of all ages; in style and discourse, written most agreeably to apostolic men; interpreting the holy Scripture according to that sense which holy mother Church has held and holds, which is to be bravely upheld to martyrdom in time of persecution by the example of our Saviour Christ; most usefully written for confuting the heresies of our times.” (15)

The very arguments by which we now hear men attempting to defend the very things which those forgeries introduced and established!

But the time for ruling by forgery was gone by, and Labbe and Cossart, wiser Jesuits than he, thought it was madness to defend the forgeries any longer, in such a light of ecclesiastical knowledge.

The forgeries are not now the law of the Roman Church, by reason of their being in the Decretum of Gratian, since the forgery is confessed. But they stand there still, as a monument to remind us that for 700 years the Roman Church maintained her doctrines by their help, and never abandoned them until Protestants had made it impossible to maintain them longer.

And now, in looking back on this awful delusion of the Church for so many ages, it does seem to us, that if Protestantism were ever so bad a thing, and if the Church of Rome had power to abolish it from the world with a breath, it might still be prudent for that infallible Church to keep a few Protestants still, just to preserve her from being for ever deceived through the presumption and the ignorance of her own infallibility.

But we have not done with forgeries, for we grieve to

(13) . . . ut omni studio diligentiaque omnes Christifideles his presertim tam gravibus calamitosisque temporibus in recta et Catholica fide contineare curenus, ac propterea id in primis nobis agendum et providendum sit, ut omnem omnibus aberrandi ab ea occasione subtrahamus.

(14) Ac ne cuicunque lieeat eidem operi quicquam addere, vel imputare, aut invertere, nullave interpretamenta adjungere, sed prout in hac nostra urbe Roma nunc impressum fuit, semper et perpetuo integrum et incorruptum conservetur.

(15) Epistola Decretales antiquitate sua et totius mundi reverentia consecratus, omni gravitate, doctrina et sanctitate referta, testimonio et usu posteritatis omnium saeculorum confirmatas, stylo ac sermone Apostolicis viris convenientissimo exaratas, sacram Scripturam juxta eam sensum quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia interpretantes, ad martyrum tempore persecutions Christi Domini nostri exemplo fortiter sustinendum, ad hereses sui temporis redargendum utilissime scriptas. . . . —Labbe and Coss., vol. i., p. 76.

say that Roman Catholics have not done with them yet. The next Book in the canon law of the Church of Rome is, “The Decretals of Pope Gregory IX.” It is a book of far higher legal authority with them than the Decretum of Gratian; for their latest canonist, Archbishop Devoti, says of it, and the other books that followed it, “Whatever, therefore, is contained in them makes law.” (16) The reason is, because these books were actually drawn up and sanctioned by authority in the Church of Rome, which the Decretum was not.

Now, we might hardly think of looking for the forged Epistles of the early Popes in these Decretals of Pope Gregory IX., because that book was intended to be a collection of the *later* Decretals, Gratian having already embodied the former. Yet a few of the earlier have strayed into it; we have observed five; one attributed by mistake to Stephen, but really from the Epistle of Sixtus I. (17); 2. another from Stephen I. (18); 3. another from Stephen, II. (19); 4. another from Felix II. (20); 5. another from Felix I. (20). All five are from the forged Epistles, and this in the book of which the latest Roman Canonist says that everything in that book is law!

We have not, in our reading, seen it noticed that the forgeries are quoted in this Book of the Decretals of Gregory IX., and we call the attention of the learned to the fact.

But Roman Catholics are not yet clear of these forgeries. The Church of Rome still uses these forgeries to direct and govern the daily prayers of her priests and members. The Roman Breviary directs the daily prayers of the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent formally authorized Pope Pius IV. to correct that Breviary. He did correct it, and issued a bull commanding the use of it so corrected. In the service for April 26th, and in that for December 31st, what does the reader suppose we find? Why, the two lying stories which Pope Nicholas I. produced as being given by divine inspiration!—the forged Council of Marcellinus, and the forged Council of Sylvester!

These are not the only forgeries in the Roman Breviary—the daily prayers of the Roman Church. There are heaps of them, taken from the pontifical book, which had a very similar origin with the forged Decretals.

Roman Catholics, read the Roman Breviary, and think of these things.

Then turn to Clement, whom you call St. Peter’s successor, and call to mind his striking words in his *genuine* Epistle, “Search into the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost. Ye know that there is nothing wicked or forged written in them” (21).

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

NO. III.

THAT the principle of hereditary succession to ecclesiastical benefices was applied, in a very remarkable and exclusive way, to the Office of Successor of St. Patrick, at Armagh, from an early period in the tenth century to a corresponding period in the twelfth century—or, in other words, for about 200 years, counted from A.D. 926, or thereabouts, to A.D. 1129, or somewhat later—is not only a point admitted on all hands, but one also which has attracted much attention, and given rise to no small discussion. But that the same system was more or less acted on at a much earlier period, among the official personages connected with the Church in Armagh—that it was in operation there, in fact, from the very first foundation of the place, and among the highest dignitaries who flourished in it, appears to be indicated by evidence in the *Annals* not much less palpable or certain than what applies to the later history of the same church, although this evidence in the former case has attracted little or no observation.

Let us look at each case by itself, taking them in chronological order. Out of the names connected with Armagh during the first period, *i.e.*—the one ending at A.D. 927—the following selected catalogue appears to include all such as are most worthy of notice in illustration of the subject before us:—

A.D. 525. Aill, Bishop of Armagh, of the tribe of Hy-Brasil, died.

A.D. 535. Oilill, Bishop of Armagh, who was likewise of the tribe of Hy-Brasil, died.

[The Hy-Brasil territory, Dr. O’Donovan considers (*Note*, A.D. 525.) to have been co-extensive with the present barony of O’Neill East, Co. Armagh, on the south of Lough Neagh, where the Bann enters that lake.]

A.D. 557. Phelim Finn, Abbot of Armagh, died.

[Ware says that he was born in the territory of Hy-Nellan, or O’Neilland.]

A.D. 587. St. Caorlan, Bishop of Armagh, died; [*“born in a territory called Hy-Nellan,”*—*i.e.*—O’Neilland. Ware.]

A.D. 606. Hugh, son of Colga, Chief of Oriel and of all

(16) Quidquid igitur in iis comprehenditur, legem facit.—*Jus Canon.*, vol. i., p. 379.

(17) Lib. v., Tit. 7, c. 1.

(18) Lib. v., Tit. 41, c. 7.

(19) Lib. v., Tit. 1, c. 1.

(20) Lib. v., Tit. 1, c. 2.

(21) Εγκρυπτετε εις τας γραφας τας αληθεις ρησεις πνευματος του άγιου επιτασθε ότι ουδεν αέικον παραπεισμενον γεγραπται εν αυταις. —*Labbe and Coss.*, vol. i., p. 152, erat.

the Orios, died on his pilgrimage, at Clonmacnoise, [i.e., resigned his crown, to end his days in religious retirement. So saith Colgan, A.A. SS., p. 732.]

A.D. 620. Ronan, son of Toole, lord of the Orios, died.

[The Orios, as Dr. O'Donovan observes (*Note A.D. 605*), were in the eastern part of the ancient Oriel, and co-extensive with the present baronies of Orior, Co. Armagh.]

A.D. 660. St. Tomene, son of Ronan, Bishop of Armagh, died.

[He was, according to Ware, "a man of noble birth," being son, probably, to the lord Ronan, mentioned at A.D. 620 or else to another Ronan, lord also of the Orios, but son to the Hugh mentioned at A.D. 606. This son of Hugh, is not mentioned by the Four Masters but is by Adamnan, in his life of S. Columba, *Book I. Chap. 43*. The name Ronan is not very common in the Annals, and the only one specially identified in them, in connection with the north of Ireland, in the sixth century or the seventh, is the Ronan whose name occurs at A.D. 620, whose territory being in the present Co. Armagh, it is very probable that he was the father of the last-mentioned.]

A.D. 704. Flann Feola, son of Scanlan, Abbot of Armagh, died.

[He was, according to Harris's *Ware*, of the race of Colla-da-chrioch, brother to Colla Uais, monarch of Ireland, A.D. 327; and Brasal, head of the Hy-Brasil family, was great grandson of the same Colla-da-chrioch.]

A.D. 729. Sweeney, son of Cronnmael, son of Ronan, Bishop of Armagh, died June 21st. He was of the Hy-Niallain tribe.

[He seems plainly to have been a nephew of Tomene, or Thomian, above named at A.D. 660. Of his family Dr. O'Donovan remarks here:—"This tribe, who furnished so many archbishops to the See of Armagh, were seated in the present baronies of O'Neilland, County Armagh."]

A.D. 747. Kelepedair, Abbot of Armagh, died. He was of the Hy-Brasil tribe.

A.D. 771. Fardacy, Abbot of Armagh, son to Sweeney, son of Ronan, son of Crunnmael, died.

[He was evidently a near relative to Tomian, A.D. 660, and Sweeney, A.D. 729. His grandfather, Ronan, may, perhaps, have been brother to the latter. Dr. O'Donovan remarks of him, that he is set down as Archbishop of Armagh, in the catalogue in the Psalter of Cashel, and that he succeeded in 758. Generally, it may be remarked, that the persons called Abbots of Armagh, in the *Annals*, are considered to have been the same with the Primates of Ireland, although there is much reason to doubt the accuracy of the prevalent views entertained on the subject.]

A.D. 779. Kearney, son of Sweeney, Prior of Armagh, died.

[He appears to have been son to Bishop Sweeney, A.D. 729. In the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 783, he is called *equoniamus*, (i.e., for *economus*, 'house steward') of Armagh.]

A.D. 791. Hoey, son of Kearney, *economus* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 792. Dudalehe, son of Siomach, Abbot of Armagh, died.

A.D. 806. Conway, son of Dudalehe, Abbot of Armagh, died suddenly.

A.D. 807. Torbach, son of Gorman, Scribe, Lector, and Abbot of Armagh, died.

[He was son to German, Abbot of Louth, and father to Egan, Abbot of Louth, according to what we have seen already, in the first of these papers on the subject under investigation.]

A.D. 808. Toichea Ua Tierney, of Tir-Inclair, Abbot of Armagh, died.

A.D. 812. Cumusgach, son of Kearney, *Economus* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 825. [The Four Masters record at length, under this year, how Cumusgach, son of Cahal, Lord of Oriel, deposed Owen Monaitreach from the primacy, to put in his own maternal half-brother, Artri; whereupon Owen appealed to Niall Caille, supreme King of Ireland, to defend his rights; which Niall accordingly did, with bloody slaughter of the Oriel men, among whom fell Cumusgach also; and Owen, regaining the primacy, held it for nine years after, with the aid of the secular power—i.e., of his friend Niall: so little idea had the Irish in those days of appealing for the settlement of such a question to any foreign ecclesiastical tribunal.]

A.D. 829. Sweeney, son of Farney, Abbot of Armagh for the space of two months, died. [The *Annals of Ulster* call him Sweeney, son of Forannan. See at A.D. 834 below.]

A.D. 831. Bathyal, son of Sweeney, priest of Armagh, died.

A.D. 834. A change of Abbots at Armagh—viz., Forannan of Rath-mic-Malais being substituted in the room of Dermot Ua Tierney.

A.D. 841. Murray, son of Kearney, *Economus* of Armagh, died.

A.D. 863. Kearney, son of Farney, prior of Armagh, died.

A.D. 867. Flann, son of Ferchir, Abbot of Lann Leire, and *Economus* of Armagh, died.

[His father Ferchir seems to have been, without doubt, the Abbot of Lann Leire, who died in A.D. 848.]

According to Keating, O'Conor, and others, the brothers known as the three Collas (sons of Hector Devlan, son of Carbery Liffeachair, supreme King of Ireland, A.D. 268) overran and conquered for themselves vast territories in Ulster, in A.D. 331 or 332, destroying withal the royal palace of Ermania, or Eamhain Macha, now the Navan Fort, close by Armagh. Colla Dachrioch, one of the three, became ancestor of the MacMahons of Monaghan, the Magnires of Fermanagh, and the O'Hanlons and MacCanns of Armagh; and his great-grandson Brasal, as we have seen above, became progenitor of the Hy Brasil or Clann Brasil family, who were anciently settled in the present O'Neilland in that county. In this royal race appears to have been vested the chief power and interest connected with the prerogatives belonging to the Successor of St. Patrick, his office, and appointment, from the earliest period, for many successive ages. Thus may we understand the mode in which there came to be so many of those dignitaries from the district of O'Neilland, the family of Hy-Brasil, and the race of Colla Da-chrioch. And it would seem to have been nothing else than an opposition to this powerful influence, on the part of the Owen mentioned at A.D. 825, that involved him in that struggle, in defence of his claims as a member of a different family, which occasioned so much bloodshed and destruction as is noticed in connection with the history of that year. That family influence greatly affected, if it did not wholly regulate, the successive appointments to the primacy and other offices referred to in the above extracts, they certainly appear strongly to indicate. But the principle was not, perhaps, then, either so exclusively acted on, or so productive of abuses in other ways, as in the period which follows: and this may possibly have been one reason why the circumstance, as connected with the former period, has attracted so very little attention, while so much has been bestowed on its results as exhibited in the history of the latter.

Proceeding now to this latter portion of the subject, we find, in the corresponding part of the *Annals*, i.e., from an early part of the tenth to the middle of the 12th century, the following entries, bearing more or less on it:—

A.D. 925. St. Maelbride, son of Tornan, successor of Patrick, &c., died at a good old age.

A.D. 936. Two successors of Patrick—viz. Joseph, scribe, bishop, and anchorite, the wisest of the Irish, and Maelpatrick, son of Maeltilla, bishop and wise man, who had been Abbot for five months, died.

A.D. 946. Casey, son of Allche, Bishop of Cinel-Owen, i.e., Tyrone, died.

A.D. 957. Casey, of Drumhorry, son of Dulgen, successor of Patrick, a bishop eminent among the Irish, died.

A.D. 965. A change of Abbots at Armagh—viz., Ducalehe in the place of Murray of Slievegullion.

A.D. 966. Murray, son of Fergus, successor of Patrick, died. Casey, son of Murchadhan, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 980. Conaing Ua Flannagain, vice-Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 982. MURRAY, son of Murechan, prior of Armagh, died.

A.D. 983. Murray Ua Flannagain, lector of Armagh, died.

A.D. 985. A great riot in Armagh on the Sunday before Lammas, &c., in which was killed a son of Traynor.

A.D. 993. MUBECHAN of Bodoney, successor of Patrick, made a visitation of Tyrone, &c.

A.D. 994. Clerken, son of Leren, priest of Armagh, died. Maclmury, son of Scanlan, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 998. Dudalehe, son of Kellach, successor of Patrick and Columkille, died June 2nd.

A.D. 1001. Traynor, son of Kelehan, prior of Armagh, killed. A change of Abbots in Armagh—viz., Maclmury, son of Hoey, substituted in the room of Muregan of Bodoney.

A.D. 1003. HOEY Ua Flannagain, Erenach of the Strangers' Asylum in Armagh, and of Clonfeacle, and a sage of repute among the people of Ireland, died.

A.D. 1006. Arvey, son of Cosgry, Bishop and Scribe of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1010. Murray, son of Creehan, successor of Columkille, and lector of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1011. Scoly, son of Clerken, noble priest of Armagh, [died of an epidemic.]

A.D. 1015. Flannagan, son of Conaing, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1020. MAELMURRY, son of Hoey, successor of Patrick, head of the clergy of all the north-west of Europe, and Head of the Dignity of the Western World, &c., died, and AWLEY was appointed successor of Patrick by the laity and clergy.

A.D. 1022. Malachy the great [King of Ireland], &c., died at Cro-Inis, in Lough Ennell, in the 73rd year of his age, on Sunday, September 2nd, after earnest penitence for his transgressions and offences, after the receiving of the body and blood of Christ, and after having been anointed at the hands of Awley, successor of Patrick: for he, and the successor of Columkill [i.e., Abbot of Derry,] and the successor of Kiaran [i.e., Abbot of Clonmacnoise,] and most of the seniors of Ireland, were in attendance upon him, and sung masses and hymns, psalms and canticles, for the welfare of his soul.

A.D. 1032. MAELTILLA, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1039. Murray, son of Flansgan, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1044. Niall Ua Kelahan, lord of Hy-Brasil, and his brother, i.e., Traynor, were blinded by the sons of Madden, through treachery and guile.

A.D. 1049. AWLEY, successor to Patrick, died; and DUDALEHE, son of MAELMURRY, son of Hoey, succeeded to his place, from the office of Lector. And Hugh Ua Forrey succeeded to the Leetorship.

A.D. 1053. Dulgen, noble priest of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1056. Hugh Ua Forrey, chief Lector and eminent Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1061. Conaing, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1063. Madden Ua Kelehan, prior of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1064. DUDALEHE, son of Maelmury, successor of Patrick, died, after choice penance; and MELISA, son to Awley, succeeded to the abbacy.

A.D. 1068. Colman Ua Creehan, lector of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1069. Flannagan, son of Hugh, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died after a well-spent life.

A.D. 1075. CUMUSOACH Ua Heron, abbot of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1077. Elva, wife to the Lord of the Orios, and successor of Moninna [i.e., Abbess of Killeavy, near Newry], died.

[N.B.—She was, no doubt, sister to the Conaing mentioned at A.D. 1061, above, he being called in the *Annals of Ulster* 'Conaing,' son to Innavar, and she, in like manner, 'Elva, daughter to Innavar.' Dr. O'Donovan's remark on her is as follows:—"This is an instance of a married woman being successor of St. Moninne."]

A.D. 1089. Gilpatrick Ua Kelehan, vice-abbot—i.e., prior, of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1091. MELISA, successor of Patrick, died after penance, on December 20th; and DONALD, son of Awley, was immediately appointed in his stead.

[This Donald was brother to Melisa, both being sons of Primate Awley (A.D. 1049, and A.D. 1064, sup.). A sister of theirs is thus noticed in the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 1078:—"Duvesa, daughter to Awley, the successor of Patrick, and wife to the King of the Orios, died." See the entry at A.D. 660, above, and the note there.]

A.D. 1096. Maelpatrick, son of Arvey, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1099. Kencorach Ua Boyle succeeded to the bishopric of Armagh, on Whit-sunday.

A.D. 1105. DONALD, son of Awley, exalted successor of Patrick, &c., died. . . . KELLACH, son to Hugh, son of Melisa, was appointed to the successorship of Patrick by the election of the men of Ireland, and took his orders on St. Adamnan's day.

[The death of Kellach's father, "Hugh, son of Melisa, successor of Patrick," is noticed in the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 1095, but omitted by the Four Masters.]

A.D. 1106. Kencorach Ua Boyle, Bishop of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1108. Hugh, son of DUDALEHE, one entitled to the office of successor of Patrick, and who was Vice Erenach of Armagh, died.

A.D. 1113. Flannagan, son to MELISA, entitled to become successor of St. Patrick, died after unction and choice penance.

A.D. 1129. KELLACH, successor of Patrick, &c., died. . . . MURTAGH, son of DONALD, was therewith appointed to the successorship of Patrick.

A.D. 1132. MAELMOGUE Ua Morgair—[i.e., the famous St. Malachy,] sat in the successorship of Patrick, by desire of the clergy of Ireland. . . . Maelbride, son of Dulgen, noble priest of Armagh, &c., died August 27, aged 80.

A.D. 1133. Conaing, son of DUDALEHE, Vice Erenach of Armagh, died. . . . MURTOGH, successor of Patrick, made a visitation of Tyrone, &c.

A.D. 1134. Maelmogue Ua Morgair made a visitation of Munster, &c. . . . MURTOGH, son of DONALD, son of AWLEY, successor of Patrick, died, after the victory of martydom and penance [i.e., died penitent and triumphant over all his earthly troubles]. NIALL, son of Hugh, was appointed to the successorship of Patrick. A change of abbots took place in Armagh, Maelmogue Ua Morgair being substituted for Niall, &c.

A.D. 1135. Flann Ua Shiuney, warden of the Staff of Jesus [i.e., the Crosier of St. Patrick, supposed by the Irish to convey to the possessor a title to the primacy], died. Maelmogue Ua Morgair, successor of Patrick, bought the Staff of Jesus, &c.

A.D. 1136. Maelmogue Ua Morgair, successor of Patrick, visited Munster. A change of abbots took place in Armagh, Niall, son of Hugh, being substituted in place of Maelmogue. . . . Maelmogue resigned the successorship of Patrick for the sake of God.

A.D. 1137. A change of abbots in Armagh—viz., the Erenach of Derry [Gelasius] in place of NIALL, son of Hugh.

A.D. 1139. NIALL, son to Hugh, son of MELISA, successor of Patrick for a time, died, after earnest penitence.

Among the prelates, whose names occur in the latter part of this list especially, the system of hereditary succession comes out in a very plain and striking light. Heaney, an Erenach of Armagh, who died in 1068, was father to

Maelmury, primate in 1020, who, dying in this latter year, was immediately succeeded by Awley. After him comes, A.D. 1049, Dodalche, son to primate Maelmury aforesaid; next, A.D. 1064, Melisa, son to primate Awley. Then, A.D., 1091, Donald, another son to primate Awley. After him, A.D. 1105, Kellach, or Celsus, grandson to Melisa. Then, opposed by Malachy, but still acknowledged as primate in the Irish Annals, Murtoogh, son to Primate Donald, A.D. 1120; and, after him again, A.D. 1134, Niall, son of Hugh, and brother to Primate Kellach.

How much longer this interesting family succession might have gone on inheriting the chief place of dignity in the Irish Church, according to their national system of Tanistry, had not such a course been interrupted by extraneous causes, it is impossible to say. But what was thought of the system when it began to attract attention abroad, and how it came to be altered, will appear in what is to follow.

(To be continued.)

THE PARISH PRIEST AND HIS PARISHIONERS,

Times of controversy are often times of trouble and annoyance to the religious instructors of the people. We sometimes think that the Roman Catholic clergy of the present day must look back with a sigh of regret to the comparatively quiet and tranquil lives which their predecessors passed in this country eighty or one hundred years ago; or, still more, to that long period of repose, which lasted from the seventh to the fifteenth century, and to which ill-natured writers have given the name of "the dark ages." In those days, the clergy led an easy life; their peace was undisturbed, and their slumber was unbroken by the angry storms of controversy. There were but few books, and no newspapers or penny posts, in those days. What little learning there was, was altogether in the hands of the priests, just as it was in ancient times among the Egyptians; and the clergy could teach the people *what* they pleased, and *how* they pleased, without fear of reproof or contradiction. If they chose to tell their flocks that purgatory or extreme unction were taught by our blessed Lord, in the gospels, the people were sure to believe them; for but few of them, from the prince to the peasant, were able to read, and fewer still had a copy of the Bible in their possession. If a priest, in his sermon, were to quote the authority of St. Augustine, or St. Chrysostom, or any other of the ancient fathers, in proof of the Pope's infallibility, he might be absolutely certain that his assertion, whether true or false, would be implicitly believed; for there was no one to contradict him. In short, with regard to all matters relating to books or learning, the people were in the condition of blind men, who, if they wished to know anything at all, were obliged to see with the priest's eyes.

Now, however, the case is widely different. Knowledge is not confined to the priesthood; the schoolmaster is abroad; and mankind can no longer be kept in the leading-strings by which, in olden times, they were wont to be led. Men have learned to read, aye, and to think for themselves; and it is no wonder that religion, the most important of all concerns, should now begin to occupy much of their thoughts. Now-a-days, if a priest, in his sermon from the altar, quotes a passage from scripture (though it is commonly said that this is not a very usual occurrence), many of his hearers have their Douay bibles at home, and can quickly tell whether the priest be right or wrong. If he brings forward any argument from the fathers, for the authority of the church, the people need not take his word for it. They can read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, or they can go to some controversial sermon, or, in some other way they can contrive to learn both sides of the question; and those of them who are really in earnest, and anxious to be taught the truth, can lay their doubts before the priest, and ask him to remove their difficulties. From all that we can learn, however, the priests in general are not at all fond of this. They do not like to be asked questions, and no wonder; for the questions are often puzzling questions, and require a good deal of learning to answer; and the joint sagacity of the parish priest and the coadjutor are often unequal to the task, especially if they happen to have forgotten what they learned at Maynooth. And then, if by any chance they should happen to be drawn into an argument with a Protestant clergyman or layman, in the presence of any of their own flock, it is a very unpleasant thing for them to be beaten, (for such accidents will sometimes happen, even in the best regulated parishes), and to be then obliged to scold and to get angry. When people lose their temper, it is generally a sure sign that they are getting the worst of the argument. This happened not long ago to the parish priest of Ballymartyr, the day he preached his sermon about "the Rock of the Church." But, before I tell you the story, I had better explain, in the first place, how the matter came about.

Ballymartyr is thought by some persons to be the prettiest village in all Munster. It is many years since I have been there, and I do not know what changes the famine or the emigration may have made in it: but, when I knew it, it was quite a pleasure to walk or ride through it, from the contrast which it afforded to most Irish villages. It consisted chiefly of one long street of white-washed cottages, most of which were models of neatness. At one end there was a handsome nobleman's place, the road to which

was bordered by a double row of tall old trees, whose long branches had interlaced, and, in summer time, proved an effectual screen against the burning rays of the sun. The old church stood on a little hill, overlooking one end of the village; and at the other, a large new chapel had recently been erected. Altogether, it would be hard to meet with a calmer or a prettier spot.

In olden times, the Protestant clergyman and the parish priest, Father O'Reilly, used to get on very peacefully together. The former, to his shame be it said, was a careless, lazy man, who did not look after his own flock, much less the Roman Catholics. He contented himself with going through the ordinary services in church, and allowed the priest, unchecked and unheeded, to carry off, from time to time, many members of his small congregation. This was chiefly done by the promotion of mixed marriages; when these took place, the children, almost as a matter of course, went to mass; and it is in this way, as every body knows, that so many persons in Ireland are now Roman Catholics, whose grandfathers or grandmothers were Protestants. In our own day, the Protestant clergy do their duty better, and the children of mixed marriages are often taught and brought up as Protestants, which is the reason, I suppose, why Archbishop Cullen, in his last jubilee pastoral, has pronounced such a bitter condemnation of these marriages. Had that prohibition always been in force, Ireland would have been, for the most part, a Protestant country now.

However, the old clergyman at last died, and a new one, the Rev. Mr. Smith, came to Ballymartyr, in his stead. He was a hard-working, active man, up early and late, who knew every house, and almost every person in his parish, and had a kind word for everybody. He established a relief society, to distribute food and clothing to the poor; he got up schools, and provided the best masters for them; and, in short, he left nothing undone to promote the welfare of the people. The old churchyard, as I have said, was on a hill-side, overlooking the little village; and sometimes, when any person died, and the country people, as will often happen, came in crowds to his funeral, Mr. Smith would stand on a tombstone, with his hat off, in such a position that the wind carried what he said, and would speak a word in season to them, about death and eternity, and their immortal souls, and would direct them to Jesus, the only Saviour of sinners. Emboldened by the kindly reception he met with on these occasions, and encouraged by the attention with which his remarks were received, he, at last, ventured to hold some evening lectures in his church, to discuss, in a friendly way, the principal points of controversy between the Churches of England and Rome. He is now gone to his rest, having been carried off by the famine fever, which he caught while carrying food to a starving Roman Catholic family; but his memory is still fondly cherished by the warm-hearted people among whom his life was spent.

Among the persons who used sometimes to go to these lectures, was a respectable farmer, named John Mahony. This man bore a high character among his neighbours for steadiness and good conduct. He lived in a neat cottage, at the far end of the row of trees before mentioned, and was looked upon, by Father O'Reilly, as one of the best members of his flock. He was never absent from his place at mass; his Easter dues were punctually paid, and his house was always one of the "stations" visited by the priest in his annual rounds. Some time, however, before the date of our story, one or two circumstances had occurred, which rather weakened Mahony's confidence in Father O'Reilly. One night, his wife Norah, whom he dearly loved, was taken dangerously ill—so much so, that she was not expected to live many hours. The distracted husband sent a messenger in all haste for the priest, to administer to her the last rites of the Church. The way was long, and the night wet and tempestuous, and Father O'Reilly, though not in general an indolent man, could not bring himself to leave his fireside, and persisted in saying, that the case was not so urgent as was supposed. To satisfy the importunity of the messenger, he gave him the vessel containing the holy oil,* and promised to be at the house early the next morning. When he arrived, however, Mrs. Mahony was dead.

The grief of John Mahony for the loss of his wife was much increased by the injury which he believed she had suffered from the absence of Father O'Reilly, and his vexation was augmented when the priest asked what seemed to him to be a very large sum as the price of the masses to be said for her soul. Father O'Reilly was not commonly a griping man; but the new chapel which I before mentioned had cost more money than he expected, and the balance must be made up some way or other. Mahony would have given all he possessed in the world if he thought it would save his departed wife a moment's pain; but somehow the priest's carelessness about extreme unction made

* A similar occurrence happened, a short time since, in the West of Ireland. The survivor shortly after became a Protestant. The writer had an interesting conversation, about three summers ago, in Switzerland, with an intelligent Chamouni guide, which shows how severe Roman Catholics are to these instances of neglect. "There are seven priests," said he, "in Chamouni; sometimes they all go off together to the town of Servoz to amuse themselves; and if any person is sick, he may die during their absence. Now, the priests are always telling us that if we die without the rites of the Church, we shall be badly off in the next world, and yet they go away themselves, and expose us to this very danger. They must either be very hard-hearted men," he added, "or else they cannot believe what they tell us."

him doubt whether the masses would really help her out of purgatory. Mr. Ferguson, a gentleman of considerable learning, who lived near Mahony, and used often talk with him on the road, once made a remark on this subject which caused a very deep impression. "There are two things," said Mr. Ferguson, "which I think, if I were a Roman Catholic, I should never like in the Pope, because they seem to me to argue a great want of good nature. The one is, that he can see his children wrangle so fiercely about the sense of Scripture, and yet will not give out the infallible meaning of every place that is controverted; and the other is, that he suffers so many souls to lie in purgatory when he may let them all forth if he please, which yet he will not do, unless money is paid him." Mahony's eldest little boy used to bring home his Douay Testament from school, and his father happened one day to take it up, and opened it at the place in the Acts (chapter viii. 20), where St. Peter said to Simon Magus, who offered him money—"Keep thy money to thyself to perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." "Deliverance from purgatory," said Mahony to himself, when he read these words, "is surely the gift of God; and can the priests be the true followers of St. Peter if they refuse to say masses unless they are paid for them? Is it not too bad that the advantage which the rich have over the poor in this world should last even beyond the grave?"*

These feelings were shared by others in the parish besides John Mahony; but the circumstances above-mentioned caused them to take a stronger hold of his mind than of the rest. The doubts which he began to entertain of the truth of the Roman Catholic system were considerably strengthened by what he heard at one or two of Mr. Smith's lectures. He took more interest than he had hitherto done in the discussion of the points of difference between the two churches, and he used sometimes talk the matter over with one or two of his neighbours of an evening, after the work of the day was done. Father O'Reilly quickly discovered that several of his flock were beginning to think for themselves, and the discovery caused him no small alarm. He had denounced Mr. Smith's lectures from the altar; but the curiosity of the people had been excited, and although they stopped attending them for a time, after a little while they came as freely to the lectures as before. What was Father O'Reilly to do? After long deliberation, when he found that he could not silence Mr. Smith, he determined to try and meet him at his own weapons, by taking up the controversy himself. Accordingly notice was given in the parish that on the following Sunday, after last mass, Father O'Reilly would preach a sermon on the authority of the Church. Great interest was excited by this notice, and the chapel was crowded to excess.

Father O'Reilly took for his text the well-known passage of St. Matthew's Gospel (xvi. 18)—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." On these words he delivered a long and clever address to his flock, in the course of which he did not spare the Bible-readers, who were causing him so much trouble and uneasiness. "Protestants," said he, "are always talking about the Bible, and arguing out of the Bible; but why won't they listen to *all* that the Bible says? Did not our Blessed Lord declare, in words so plain that the children yonder can understand them, that St. Peter was to be the rock on which the holy Catholic Church was to be built?" Then art Peter," said he. Now, Peter means a rock; and will any man tell me where this rock is to be found, except in our holy father the Pope and the Catholic Church? Stand out before me and the congregation, any of you that go sneaking along in the dark to listen to Parson Smith. 'Tis well seen that you are ashamed of what you're doing, leaving the Church in which you were born and bred, to follow a ranting Methodist like him. Stand out before me, and tell me, if any of you can, on what rock is Parson Smith's Church built? Can he claim any share in St. Peter, when, as everybody knows, the name of Protestant was never thought or heard of until the time of the turn-coat, Luther, about three hundred years ago? You say you want to belong to Christ's Church; and how can you belong to it, if you leave the Church that is built on St. Peter, the rock and foundation-stone that Christ himself laid? And where would you look for St. Peter's Church, if not in the holy Church of Rome? The blessed St. Peter lived at Rome, and died at Rome. His bones are under the high-altar, where the Pope himself says Mass. The Catholic Church is not like your new-fangled Protestant sects—it is as old as St. Peter himself; it has existed from the very beginning of Christianity; it has grown and spread to the furthest corners of the world, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it!"

This, and much more to the same purport, and sup-

* If our friend Mahony's reading had extended to the history of the Council of Trent, he would have seen that some of the learned Fathers of that body were quite of his way of thinking. They proposed to decree that the sacraments should be given for nothing, and that not only should the priest ask for nothing, but that he should accept of nothing. "Freely ye have received," said the Grapet (Matt. x. 8), "freely give." Their advice, however, was rejected by the rest. The great majority of the venerable men who composed the Council could not find it in their hearts to assent to such a liberal scheme, which would for ever dry up some of the richest sources of their wealth. Their feelings, in fact, seem to have corresponded pretty closely with those of the miser in "Old Mortality"—"I canna do it, Allie, I canna do it—I canna part with the siler." And so they left the old usages and abuses as they found them.—Vide Father Paul Sarpi, Hist. Conc. Trid. lib. ii. § 87..